

Applicant: Korolainen et al.
Application No.: 10/599,179
Response to Office action mailed June 8, 2010
Response filed September 3, 2010

Remarks

Claims 10–11, 13–22, 24–29 remain pending in the application. Claims 12 and 23 have been canceled. In the Office action dated Jun, 8, 2010, claims 10, 11, 14–16, 19, and 26 were rejected as obvious over Bonander et al. (U.S. Patent 5,785,636) in view of DE 29613795. Claim 23 was rejected as obvious over Bonander et al. in view of DE '795 as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of WO 9958761.

Claims 27–29 were allowed. Claims 12,13,17,18, 20–22, 24 and 25 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The specification has been amended for clarity to correct an error obvious in context.

Claim 10 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 12, and some of the limitations of intervening claim 11 but is not limited to a beam which is essentially I-shaped in cross-section. This amendment is supported by the allowed subject matter of claim 17 which clearly indicates the beam need not be I-shaped.

Claim 17 has ben rewritten in independent form, and to clarify that the inner non-rotating structure is at least partly comprised of a fiber-reinforced *polymeric* material (specification paragraph [0011]).

Claims 19, 20, 21, and 22 have been amended to depend directly on amended claim 10 and conform to the language of amended claim 10, which includes some of the limitations of intervening claim 11 but is not limited to a beam which is essentially I-shaped in cross-section.

Claim 24 has been rewritten in independent form including the limitations of claim 23 and 10 and is amended to more clearly be directed to a suction roll.

Claims 10, 20, 21, 24, and 25 further clarify that the composite material of reinforcing fibers in a matrix of *polymeric* material (specification paragraph [0011]).

The remaining claims add further limitations which in combination with the claim from which they depend are patentable.

Applicant: Korolainen et al.
Application No.: 10/599,179
Response to Office action mailed June 8, 2010
Response filed September 3, 2010

Applicant believes that no new matter has been added by this amendment.

Applicant submits that the claims, as amended, are in condition for allowance.
Favorable action thereon is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Patrick J. G. Stiennon, Reg. No. 34934
Attorney for Applicant
Stiennon & Stiennon
P.O. Box 1667
Madison, Wisconsin 53701-1667
(608) 250-4870
Amdt2.res

September 3, 2010 (2:44pm)